

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

JANET M. SCHULER, ET AL.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
vs.	)	NO. CIV-10-0341-HE
	)	
SMITHKLINE BEECHAM CORP.,	)	
ET AL.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**ORDER**


On February 18, 2011, the court entered its order directing plaintiff to show cause within 10 days why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. Plaintiff has not responded to the order.

A court may, in the exercise of sound discretion, dismiss a cause of action for want of prosecution. Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 630-31 (1962); Joplin v. Southwestern Bell Tel. Co., 671 F.2d 1274, 1275 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1982); Petty v. Manpower, 591 F.2d 615, 617 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1979). “In exercising this power, the [c]ourt has the authority to enforce its orders with a view to promptly processing and adjudicating its lawsuits.” Roberts v. McCroy, 693 F. Supp. 998, 1009 (W.D. Okla. 1987) (citing Stanley v. Continental Oil Co., 536 F.2d 914 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1976)).

Here, plaintiff has not offered any justification for her failure to pursue the case and none is otherwise apparent. This case is therefore **DISMISSED** without prejudice to its refiling.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated this 2nd day of March, 2011.



---

JOE HEATON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE